

REMARKS

Claims 1-22 are pending in this application.

The courtesies extended to Applicant's representative by Examiners Gray and Martin at the interview held November 21, are appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below and constitute Applicants' record of the interview.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 5, 7-11, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 5,670,995 to Kupcho. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claims 1, 11 and 22 recite a guide assembly "configured to allow movement of the printhead around both linear and arcuate portions of the endless loop drive path" and a controller that controls the drive assembly to traverse over "at least one-half the length of the endless drive belt loop to advance the printhead across a linear print zone and an arcuate non-print zone."

As agreed to by the Examiners during the personal interview, Kupcho fails to teach such features and instead uses a conventional traversing printhead guided along a linear path. Accordingly, independent claims 1, 11 and 22 and claims dependent therefrom define over Kupcho. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 2 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Kupcho in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,804,285 to Bradford. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claims 1 and 11 and Kupcho are discussed above. Bradford fails to overcome the deficiencies of Kupcho with respect to independent claims 1 and 11. Accordingly, dependent claims 2 and 12 are allowable for their dependence on allowable base claims and for the additional features recited therein. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 3, 4, 13, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Kupcho and Bradford, further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,129,746 to Epstein. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claims 1 and 11, Kupcho and Bradford are discussed above. Epstein fails to overcome the deficiencies of Kupcho and Bradford with respect to independent claims 1 and 11. Accordingly, dependent claims 3, 4, 13 and 14 are allowable for their dependence on allowable base claims and for the additional features recited therein. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Kupcho in view of U.S. Patent Appl. Publ. No. US2003/0227511A1 to Menendez. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 11 and Kupcho are discussed above. Menendez fails to overcome the deficiencies of Kupcho with respect to independent claim 11. Accordingly, dependent claim 17 is allowable for its dependence on an allowable base claim and for the additional features recited therein. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Kupcho in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,980,009 Goodwin et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 and Kupcho are discussed above. Goodwin fails to overcome the deficiencies of Kupcho with respect to independent claim 1. Accordingly, dependent claim 6 is allowable for its dependence on an allowable base claim and for the additional features recited therein. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Kupcho in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,325,503 to McCue, Jr. et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 11 and Kupcho are discussed above. McCue, Jr. fails to overcome the deficiencies of Kupcho with respect to independent claim 11. Accordingly, dependent

claim 21 is allowable for its dependence on an allowable base claim and for the additional features recited therein. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-22 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Stephen P. Catlin
Registration No. 36,101

JAO:SPC/fpw

Date: November 21, 2005

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461
--